DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 554 HE 009 869

AUTHOR Keane, Joseph A.
TITLE Characteristics of Merit Rating Based Salary Plans at a Number of Small Private American Colleges.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 29p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Awards; *College Faculty; Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; *Merit Rating Programs; *Private Colleges; *Rating Scales; Salary Differentials; *Small Colleges; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Surveys; *Teacher Salaries

ABSTRACT

Information on existing salary systems at 82 small private colleges throughout The U.S. is presented. Included are discussions on salary scales in relation to merit rating, and the monetary value of typical awards. Twenty-eight of the 82 colleges indicated ongoing merit rating plans. Study results include the following: (1) merit rating is not the dominant theme in salary structures but is supplemental to several methods of determining and distributing salaries: (2) ranking of faculty and structured salary scales at the merit colleges suggest that they are highly typical; (3) the salaries at the merit colleges may be slightly higher than those at non-merit colleges; (4) the non-merit colleges include a significant number without structured salary scales; (5) evaluation of teaching by students was not a specific criteria for judgment of merit rating, although it is certainly implicit in determination of teacher effectiveness; and (6) the fact that the majority of non-merit campuses compensate faculty for extra teaching, in contrast to the merit colleges, suggests that merit rating systems may have resulted in the reallocation of salary funds from one area to another. (SPG)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED153554

# CHARACTERISTICS OF MERIT RATING BASED SALARY PLANS AT A NUMBER OF SMALL PRIVATE AMERICAN COLLEGES

Joseph A. Keane, Ph. D.

St. Thomas Aquinas College
Sparkill, New York

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph A. Keane

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 009 869

## INTRODUCTION

A cornerstone of the American dream is the concept that unequals should not be paid equally; effort and merit deserve to be rewarded either financially, through incentives, or by a system for promotion of personnel.

Few questions bring forth more ardent supporters or fervent opponents than merit rating of college faculty members. Yet, with decreasing numbers of younger college students and increasing financial concerns, campus studies of promotion and tenure procedures are influencing a revival of analyses of salary and promotion plans based on merit rating. The values and disadvantages of merit related compensatory plans are being critically examined on many college campuses today.

The purpose of this study is to provide some needed information on existing salary systems at a number of small private colleges throughout the United States. The results include salary scales in relation to merit rating systems, judgment criteria for merit based salary increases, personnel involved in the design and implementation of the merit rating, and the monetary value of typical awards. The study does not present arguments for or against the establishment of merit rating systems or methods of implementing them, as these arguments are well documented in the literature (2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11). The results of the study provide a resource for personnel who need and desire characteristics of existing merit rating systems as input for discussions on their campuses.

To define merit rating is to embark on the controversies that surround the concept itself because the definition and scope of merit vary greatly. A number of professional teachers' organizations have avoided discussing or interpreting the meaning of merit rating, and in some cases have been openly opposed to salary systems based on merit considerations (1,3,5,8). Merit rating is most often related to the evaluation of teaching competence and the subsequent paying of a teacher according to the quality of his/her teaching. This dependence upon evaluation of faculty is the basis of the procedural opposition to merit rating. Procedural opponents argue that: that there is no objective method of evaluating merit; the reliability and validity in measuring teacher effectiveness is suspect; objectivity in measuring the finer degrees of teaching competency is lacking; measuring teacher effectiveness relies on trial and error because little reliable research has been done. There are also the philosophical opponents who argue that: unhealthy competition among faculty is produced; performance and quality of education are adversely effected; the fact that faculty members are underpaid is hidden (6).

Why, then, should merit based salary systems be considered in conjunction with, or in preference to, structured salary scales? The structured scales may not make sense to some, but they work; they are defensible, practical and acceptable to the majority. In order to justify merit based systems, one must believe that the recruitment, classification, and promotion of faculty should be influenced by credentials, performance, and periodic review. Van Fleet (10) has presented one argument for merit rating by comparing the objectives

for management personnel to those for salary administration in higher education. In management, the objectives are:

1) To attract competent personnel.
2) To retain qualified personnel.
3) To provide incentives for performance.
4) To provide incentives for development.
5) To protect the interests of organizational claimants.

For teaching personnel, these objectives become:

a) To meet or surpass the average salary (by rank) in similar institutions.
b) To provide annual increase at least equal to those provided by similar institutions.
c) To provide merit increases based upon evaluations of teaching performance.
d) To provide merit increases based upon research and publications activity.
e) To provide merit increases based on individuals' contributions to and participation in governance.

Few will argue the importance of items (a) and (b) being necessary goals in salary administration in higher education. However, proponents of merit rating based systems maintain that items (c) through (e) are equally important in attracting and retaining superior faculty on the nation's campuses.

## THE SURVEY

In the Spring of 1977 a survey was sent to the presidents of 141 small private colleges throughout the country requesting that the most appropriate campus official complete it. In general, the surveys were returned by either the president or academic dean of the institutions. The purpose was to determine if there are active merit rating programs in operation at small private colleges in which merit salary increases

are applied in addition to the customary salary benefits. Recent research on merit rating has usually been concentrated within individual institutions having several hundred faculty members and less immediate budgetary concerns than smaller colleges (2,6). While much has been written on the general concepts on the elementary and secondary school levels, a genuine need exists for information on the characteristics of merit rating programs at small colleges.

Eighty-two (58%) colleges responded to the survey. Twenty-eight (34%) indicated ongoing merit rating plans, from informal arrangements to formal structured programs. The remaining 54 colleges did not have merit rating as of September 1976, but they provided important data concerning their decisions not to institute merit plans. The 28 merit colleges present a small statistical sample. However, they represent over one-third of the surveyed colleges and may, in fact, represent a good cross section of merit institutions of comparable size. Characteristics of the 82 colleges which responded to the survey are as follows:

1) Fifty-six colleges had full time equivalent (FTE) enrollments of 400-1000 in September 1976. Fourteen had enrollments over 1000. The remaining had enrollments less than 400 or did not respond in this area.

2) The median number of full time faculty was 45, with a range of 17-90, for institutions having merit rating, and 39, with a range of 12-83 for those without merit rating.

3) The median number of full time administrators was 17, with a range of 4-43 for merit institutions, and 12, with a range of 1-122 for non-merit institutions.

4) A formal collective bargaining unit is active on only two campuses (the AAUP and an internal faculty welfare committee).

5) Seventy-five of 76 responding colleges maintain a standard four step ranking system of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Generally, the colleges also rank part time instructors.

6) The bachelor's degree is the highest degree awarded at 75 of the colleges. Seven grant master's degrees; none grant the doctorate.

7) One-third of the colleges are less than 50 years old. One-half have begun since 1900.

SALARY SCALES AND DISTRIBUTIONS

Each college was asked if a structured salary scale was in effect, and if so, to identify the ranges for the ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Responses of the colleges having merit rating and those without a merit rating system were tabulated separately. Of the 28 merit colleges, 20 reported structured salary scales; eight do not have scales. For those without merit rating, 35 have salary scales; 17 do not, and two colleges did not respond.

Considering the colleges with salary scales, hypothetical median salary ranges were determined for each of the academic ranks by selecting the medians of the high and low salaries within the ranges for each rank. These theoretical ranges provide a common denominator for a qualitative comparison of salaries at the various colleges. The resulting ranges are presented in Table I. For each academic rank, the median salary ranges for colleges without merit rating fall below the corresponding ranges for colleges with merit rating. The data is too fragmentary to suggest that financial concerns on some campuses have precluded merit ratings. As noted later, financial concerns were not the principal reason given by the non-merit colleges for absence of

TABLE I

MEDIAN SALARY RANGES FOR TWENTY COLLEGES HAVING MERIT RATING AND THIRTY-FIVE WITHOUT MERIT RATING

| RANK | MERIT COLLEGES | NON-MERIT COLLEGES |
|---|---|---|
| Instructor | $ 9,400-12,210 | $ 8,500-10,763 |
| Assistant Professor | 10,500-14,173 | 10,000-13,016 |
| Associate Professor | 12,000-15,225 | 11,350-14,960 |
| Professor | 14,000-20,500 | 13,400-17,405 |

merit rating plans. The fact that 17 of the "non-merit" colleges lack structured salary scales is equally noteworthy and suggests that the absence of a scale may inhibit the construction of a merit rating system possibly because of the lack of a base for consideration. Of these 17 colleges, only three indicated lack of funding as the reason for the absence of merit rating systems. Eleven indicated reasons related to criteria for judgment and personnel necessary for implementation.

To illustrate the relative importance of merit ratings within salary structures, the participants were asked to indicate whether salary distributions are: an automatic step within faculty ranks (AS), equal amounts to all (EQ), cost of living (CL), merit (M), or a combination of these. The results are shown in Table II. It can be seen that merit rating is used in conjunction with, and not as a substitution, for other standard types of salary distribution; only one college relies on merit alone. Of the 28 "merit" colleges, 15 use merit ratings in conjunction with one other consideration for salary decisions with emphasis on merit plus cost of living considerations. Eleven colleges utilize merit in addition to two or more other items for salary considerations.

In the "non-merit" colleges, 26 of the 49 respondents indicated that salary distribution is based on a single consideration, either an automatic step, cost of living, or an equal amount to all. Five of these colleges indicated that merit rating plays a partial role in spite of having no formal merit rating plan.

The data in Tables I and II indicates varied salary systems in the colleges having merit rating with merit being supplemental to a larger salary structure which is based primarily on cost of living

TABLE II

SALARY DISTRIBUTION CONSIDERATIONS IN SEVENTY-SEVEN SMALL PRIVATE AMERICAN COLLEGES

| MERIT COLLEGES | | | | NON-MERIT COLLEGES | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SCALE --- | YES | NO | TOTAL | SCALE --- | YES | NO | TOTAL |
| M | 0 | 1 | (1) | M | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| M + CL | 9 | 2 | (11) | CL | 6 | 3 | (9) |
| M + EQ | 1 | 1 | (2) | EQ | 3 | 8 | (11) |
| M + AS | 1 | 1(?) | (2) | AS | 6 | 0 | (6) |
| M + CL + EQ | 2 | 0 | (2) | CL + EQ | 4 | 2 | (6) |
| M + CL + AS | 4 | 1 | (5) | CL + AS | 3 | 1 | (4) |
| M + EQ + AS | 1 | 0 | (1) | EQ + AS | 4 | 1 | (5) |
| M + AS + EQ + CL | 2 | 1 | (3) | AS + EQ + CL | 3 | 0 | (3) |
| No answer | 0 | 1 | (1) | No answer | 2 | 1 | (3) |
| | | | | M + EQ + CL | 1 | 1 | (2) |
| | | | | M + CL | 2 | 0 | (2) |
| | | | | M + AS + CL | 1 | 0 | (1) |

KEY: EQ = Equal across the board to all; CL = Cost of living;
AS = Automatic step within faculty rank

considerations. However, in colleges lacking merit rating, about one-half determine salaries using only one method for distribution. In those colleges with neither merit rating nor a structured salary scale, the salary structures appear rather rigidly programmed with 11 of the 17 colleges depending upon only one method for determination.

MERIT RATING, YES --- OR NO

It is important to consider the reasons why merit ratings are not used at many of the surveyed colleges. To this question, 37 of the 54 "non-merit" colleges responded with reasons that can be divided into five categories: fairness, difficulty of judgment, faculty rejection, lack of funds, and systems under discussion. All of the reasons reflect procedural rather than philosophical concerns. Table III summarizes the reasons and the frequencies of the responses. Six of the 37 respondents indicated a lack of funding as a reason for no merit rating. Many saw the problem as one of fairness in design and implementation of a plan.

CRITERIA FOR JUDGMENT OF MERIT RATING

In addition to full time faculty, full time administrators are eligible for merit rating for salary increases at 17 of the 28 "merit" colleges. Six colleges have merit rating for part time instructors, and four have merit rating for part time administrators. Since the survey questions applied to full time faculty, the criteria for judgment of other personnel at the colleges is unknown. Four of the colleges place limits on merit rating based salary awards to the extent that funds may be limited; no other limits were indicated by

TABLE III

REASONS FOR ABSENCE OF MERIT RATINGS AT

THIRTY-SEVEN SMALL PRIVATE COLLEGES

| REASONS | FREQUENCY | CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY |
|---|---|---|
| FAIRNESS | | 12 |
| System is discriminatory | 2 | |
| No objective evaluation method | 2 | |
| No time to set up system | 1 | |
| Indecision on who decides | 1 | |
| Lack of agreement on plan | 1 | |
| Criteria are too subjective | 1 | |
| Cannot judge equitability | 1 | |
| No established criteria | 1 | |
| Inability to evaluate deserving ones | 1 | |
| Too complex a question to be fair | 1 | |
| DIFFICULTY OF JUDGMENT | | 8 |
| Criteria difficult to judge | 8 | |
| FACULTY REJECTION | | 6 |
| Faculty prefer salary scale | 3 | |
| Have AAUP bargaining | 1 | |
| Funding would come from salary pot | 1 | |
| Cannot agree on a plan | 1 | |
| LACK OF FUNDS | | 6 |
| CURRENTLY IN DISCUSSION STAGES | | 6 |
| NO ANSWER | | 17 |

any of the colleges on the number of awards that can be made in any year.

In response to the question of criteria used in determining merit increases, 37 different items were mentioned, some as many as 19 times. While student evaluation of teaching plays an implicit role in determining teacher effectiveness, it was explicitly mentioned only once. All of the colleges employ two to six criteria to judge merit rating. Five of the colleges failed to indicate the criteria they use. This may suggest a lack of formality in those programs as will be noted later.

The individual characteristics which are judged for merit rating were divided into eighteen specific areas and grouped into three categories related to professional, organizational, and personal development of the faculty member. Table IV shows these criteria for merit rating and gives frequency of each of the characteristics. Table V shows the six most important criteria and the suggested inference level for judgments that must be made. For example, commitment to the college's goals is a high inference concept while publications reflect low inference. The viability of a merit rating system would seem to depend on having low inference items upon which to base a judgment. It is important to note that the contributions of organizational and personal development, for example, the ability to work with others and community service, serve to complement the more important professional demeanor and development of the faculty member.

DESIGN AND ADMINISTRATION

Two major questions on merit rating are: who will design the criteria

TABLE IV

CRITERIA AT TWENTY-EIGHT SMALL PRIVATE COLLEGES FOR DETERMINATION OF MERIT RATING

| PROFESSIONAL | Frequency | ORGANIZATIONAL | Frequency | PERSONAL | Frequency |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STUDENT RELATED: | | | | | |
| Teaching effectiveness and quality | 19 | Ability to work with colleges | 3 | Community service | 3 |
| Service to college | 10 | Committee work | 3 | Non-classroom activities | 1 |
| Commitment to college goals | 5 | Professional efficiency | 2 | Public service | 1 |
| Quality advising | 4 | Productivity | 1 | Campus citizenship | 1 |
| Contributions to student welfare | 3 | Campus leadership | 1 | Current salary | 1 |
| Evaluation by students, peers, administrators | 1 | | | | |
| ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS: | | | | | |
| Professional advancement and growth (graduate study, scholarly achievement, research, achievement in the arts) | 19 | | | | |
| Publications, professional recognition | 4 | | | | |

TABLE V

PRINCIPAL CRITERIA USED FOR MERIT RATING

IN TWENTY-EIGHT SMALL PRIVATE COLLEGES

| CRITERIA | FREQUENCY | INFERENCE |
|---|---|---|
| Teaching effectiveness | 19 | Low/Medium |
| Professional advancement | 19 | Low |
| Service to the college | 10 | Medium |
| Commitment to college goals | 5 | High |
| Student advising | 4 | Low |
| Publications | 4 | Low |

for merit, and who will judge the merit qualifications and make subsequent awards?

The design of the merit rating plans which were surveyed can be divided into three broad groups: faculty generated criteria, joint faculty-administration design, and programs initiated by administrative personnel. The faculty generated systems were written by either a committee of the whole or by smaller faculty committees, such as a development committee, an academic committee, or a personnel committee. Faculty-administration generated plans generally included the academic dean or the president working with either a faculty committee or with department/division chairpersons. Merit plans drawn up by administrative personnel usually involved the president, dean, or Board of Trustees working individually or together.

Table VI shows this information and also indicates whether a faculty vote was taken to approve the plan. The administration of the plans is listed from lowest to highest authority e.g. D/D, D, P indicates department/division, dean and final authority with the president. Eleven of the 26 reported plans were conceived by faculty; eight plans originated with a joint faculty and administrative effort; four evolved at the administrative level. In most cases, the decision to award a merit increase follows a pattern which includes review by the department/division, the academic dean, and the president. Six colleges involve the Board of Trustees in the decision; at four colleges the decision appears to be an autonomous one by either the dean, the president, or at the department/division level. Column three indicates that when a merit rating plan originated with the faculty, a direct or indirect vote was taken on all campuses. This is not

TABLE VI

DESIGNERS/ADMINISTRATORS OF MERIT RATING

PLANS AT TWENTY-SIX SMALL PRIVATE COLLEGES

| DESIGNER | ADMINISTRATOR | FACULTY VOTE |
|---|---|---|
| FACULTY GENERATED CRITERIA (11 colleges) | | |
| Faculty | D/D, D, P | yes |
| Faculty | D, D/D, P, B | yes |
| Faculty | D/D, D, P, B | yes |
| Fac. Committee | D/D, P, B | yes |
| Fac. Committee | D/D, D | yes |
| Fac. Committee | D/D, D, P | yes |
| Fac. Committee | D, P | faculty com. vote |
| Fac. Academic Com. | self, D/D, D, P | yes |
| Fac. Personnel Com. | D/D, D, P | faculty com.vote |
| Fac. Develop. Com. | -no answer- | yes |
| Fac. Develop. Com. | D, P | in progress |
| FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION GENERATED CRITERIA (8 colleges) | | |
| Fac. Com. , Dean | D/D, D, P, B | yes |
| Rank-Promot. Com., Dean, Pres. | P | yes |
| Fac.-Adm. Com. | D, P, B | yes |
| Faculty, Dean | D/D, D, P, B | yes |
| Fac. Chairpers., Dean | D/D, D | chairperson vote |
| Chairpers., VP, Dean, Pres. | D, D/D, P | no |
| Chairpers., Rank-Ten. Com., Admin. | D/D, D, P | no |
| Fac. Com., Dean | D/D, D, P | no |
| ADMINISTRATION GENERATED CRITERIA (4 colleges) | | |
| Pres., VP | D/D | no |
| Dean | D | no |
| Pres., Dean | Fac. Com., P | no |
| Board of Trustees | D/D, D | unknown |
| OTHER (3 colleges) | | |
| Informal criteria | D/D, D, P | no |
| Informal criteria | -no answer- | -no answer- |
| No answer | D | -no answer- |

Key: D/D = Department/Division; D = Dean; P = President
B = Board of Trustees

always true in faculty-administratrive plans, and no faculty votes were taken on campuses where the plan originated at the administrative level. Actually, in only 12 of the 26 cases was a direct faculty vote taken. In the 12 colleges where partial or total administrative involvement was present, faculty votes were indicated in only four cases.

MERIT SALARY AWARDS

The colleges were asked to indicate the number and dollar value of merit awards as well as non-monetary awards during the 1976-77 academic year. The respondents exhibited great reluctance to be specific on the number and value of awards; the significance of this is noted later. Of the 28 colleges, only 13 gave specific dollar values; ten indicated general amounts such as "most in the $ 1-500 range", "varies widely," "no consistent pattern," "information not available at this time," "exact dollar amounts not available" ... Five failed to answer this query. Table VII summarizes the awards made on the 13 campuses which gave specific information. These colleges were fairly equally divided between those whose faculty voted on a merit plan and those that did not vote. In addition, no awards in excess of $1000 were made on any of the surveyed campuses. The median number of awards granted was 12 with a range of 2-55. The median percentage of faculty members granted merit awards per campus was 21% with a range of 10%-72%. Overall, 30% of the faculty members of these 13 colleges received awards in the 1976-77 academic year. The number of awards is significant. With all but three of the colleges offering more than ten awards in spite of the numerous specific criteria which must be met, it appears that the faculties at the "merit" colleges are enjoying the same "grade inflation" present at the student level of many colleges.

TABLE VII

FACULTY SIZE AND MERIT AWARDS AT THIRTEEN SMALL PRIVATE COLLEGES DURING THE 1976-77 ACADEMIC YEAR

| FACULTY SIZE | NUMBER OF MERIT AWARDS | | % OF FACULTY |
|---|---|---|---|
| | $ 1-500 | $ 501-1000 | |
| 20 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| 31 | 6 | 4 | 32 |
| 34 | 7 | 0 | 21 |
| 42 | 19 | 5 | 57 |
| 46 | 24 | 2 | 57 |
| 59 | 7 | 0 | 12 |
| 65 | 10 | 0 | 15 |
| 76 | 40 | 15 | 72 |
| 79 | 23 | 25 | 61 |
| 83 | 30 | 0 | 36 |
| 90 | 15 | 0 | 17 |
| 112 | 10 | 2 | 11 |
| 117 | 12 | 0 | 10 |

In regard to non-monetary awards, only two colleges responded affirmatively -- one grants promotions on merit and one grants length of service awards.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION

Finally, it may be important to note whether there is additional compensation to faculty members for extra teaching and/or supervision of undergraduate independent study and research. The responses are summarized in Tables VIII and IX. Table VIII indicates that 70% of the colleges compensate faculty for extra teaching. This compensation is divided between 53% of the merit colleges and 80% of those without merit rating. Table IX shows that only 21% of the colleges compensate faculty members for supervision of independent study or research, and there seems to be no correlation between those having merit rating and those who do not.

CONCLUSIONS

A number of conclusions are presented here as suggested by the information provided by the surveyed colleges. Some are very tenuous and require further investigation. It is hoped that they will provide a basis for thoughtful discussions in colleges which desire to investigate the concepts of merit based salary systems. The following are the findings of this survey:

1) Merit rating plans <u>are</u> in operation at a number of small private colleges. The systems range from highly structured programs to informal understandings between faculty and administrators. (One president indicated that the system functioned like "Topsy.")

2) Merit rating is not the dominant theme in salary structures but is supplemental to several methods of determining and distributing salaries.

TABLE VIII

COMPENSATION FOR EXTRA TEACHING AT
SEVENTY-SEVEN SMALL PRIVATE COLLEGES

| | MERIT COLLEGES | | NON-MERIT COLLEGES | | ALL COLLEGES | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SS | NSS | SS | NSS | SS | NSS |
| YES | 12 | 3 | 26 | 13 | 38 | 16 |
| NO | 7 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 15 | 8 |
| N/A | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 |

KEY: SS = those colleges with salary scales
NSS = those colleges without salary scales
N/A = no answer was given

TABLE IX

COMPENSATION FOR SUPERVISION OF INDEPENDENT STUDY OR RESEARCH AT SEVENTY-SEVEN SMALL PRIVATE COLLEGES

| | MERIT COLLEGES | | NON-MERIT COLLEGES | | ALL COLLEGES | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SS | NSS | SS | NSS | SS | NSS |
| YES | 7 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 14 | 2 |
| NO | 12 | 9 | 27 | 13 | 39 | 22 |
| N/A | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 |

KEY: SS = those colleges with salary scales

NSS = those colleges without salary scales

N/A = no answer was given

3) Ranking of faculty and structured salary scales at the "merit" colleges suggest that they are highly typical. There is no evidence that these colleges are "avant-garde" institutions.

4) The salaries at the institutions with merit rating may be slightly higher than those at non-merit colleges. This suggests the importance of financial concerns in merit discussions, although only six colleges indicated this in the survey. (See Conclusion #11).

5) The non-merit colleges include a significant number without structured salary scales. This suggests that the structured scale may be helpful in forming a base upon which merit rating systems can be built.

6) Colleges without merit rating are concerned about the procedural rather than the philosophical questions of merit.

7) Evaluation of teaching by students was not a specific criteria for judgment of merit rating, although it is certainly implicit in determination of teacher effectiveness.

8) The principal judgment criteria for merit rating are low inference concepts, for the most part.

9) The reluctance to discuss actual awards indicates a number of plans may exist in theory and not always in practice. It may be that an administrator may profess belief in merit but be reluctant to observe it in practice.

10) The granting of a surprisingly large number of merit awards brings up the question of whether some colleges may consider most salary advances as merit awards.

11) The fact that the majority of "non-merit" campuses compensate faculty for extra teaching, in contrast to the merit colleges, suggests that merit rating systems may have resulted in the reallocation of salary funds from one area to another.

The concept of merit rating remains amorphous and highly dependent upon definition. Each of the topics which were highlighted could undergo extensive investigation; particularly needed is input from faculty members. However, it is clear that a number of colleges feel that they have answered the procedural and philosophical questions to their satisfaction and have created viable merit rating based compensatory plans for faculty members.

## NOTES

1. The author wishes to acknowledge the suggestions of Drs. Donald T. McNelis and Winfield B. Wetherbee regarding the survey instrument, and the assistance in preparation of the monograph by Ms. Eileen Quinn.

## REFERENCES

1. "Do You Know Your Score on Merit Rating?" Editorial. Phi Delta Kappan 42 (Jan. 1961): 137-138.

2. Keene, T.W."Faculty Salary Increases and Evaluation of Selected Performance Variables." Research in Education 11(1976): 1-8.

3. Ladd, E.; Lipset, S. Professors, Unions, and American Higher Education. Washington: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973.

4. Mahdesian, Z. "But What's so Bad About the Old Lockstep Pay Schedules That Treat Everybody Alike? A Traditionalist Gets a Word In." American School Board Journal 157 (1970): 24.

5. Megal, C.J. "The AFL-CIO Position: Merit Rating is Unsound." Phi Delta Kappan 42 (1961): 154-156.

6. Millar, D. "Achievement Compensation for Faculty: Analysis and Proposal."Central Michigan University, unpublished 1977.

7. Mitchell, J. "Merit Rating: Past, Present, and Perhaps." Phi Delta Kappan 42 (1961): 139-142.

8. Osborne, W.B.; Ryan,J.; Shanker, A. "Three Union Leaders Talk About the Academic Future." Change 9 (1977): 31.

9. Templeton, I. "Merit Pay." Research in Education 7(1972): 1-10.

10. VanFleet, D.D. "Salary Administration in Higher Education." AAUP Bulletin 58 (1974): 413-418.

11. Weissman, R. "Merit Pay - What Merit?" Educational Digest 34 (1969): 16-19.

APPENDIX A

WHEN COMPLETED RETURN TO:

Dr. Joseph A. Keane
Director of Continuing Education
St. Thomas Aquinas College
Sparkill, New York 10976

NAME OF COLLEGE: _____

DATE FOUNDED: _____

COLLEGE PRESENTLY: Men Only_____ Women Only_____ CoEd_____

COLLEGE REGIONALLY ACCREDITED? Yes_____ No_____ Candidate_____

DEGREES AWARDED? Associates_____ Bachelors_____ Masters_____

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT ENROLLMENT: (Fall 1976, Full-time equivalent)

_____ Below 200 _____ 200 to 400 _____ 400 to 600
_____ 600 to 800 _____ 800 to 1,000 _____ Over 1,000

PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL: (Fall 1976)

| | Full-Time | Total |
|---|---|---|
| Administration | | _____ |
| Teaching | | _____ |
| TOTAL | | _____ |
| Part-Time | | |
| Administration | | _____ |
| Teaching | | _____ |

DOES YOUR COLLEGE HAVE AN ACADEMIC RANKING SYSTEM? Yes___ No____
IF YES, PLEASE IDENTIFY RANK CLASSIFICATION:

| Full-Time | Part-Time |
|---|---|
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |

DO YOU HAVE A STRUCTURED SALARY RANGE FOR FACULTY? Yes___ No_____
IF YES, PLEASE IDENTIFY RANGE FOR 1976-77 ACCORDING TO RANK BELOW:

Instructor _____ to _____
Assistant Professor _____ to _____
Associate Professor _____ to _____
Professor _____ to _____

HOW ARE SALARY INCREASES GRANTED?

Automatic step within the various ranks_____(a)
Equal amount across the board _____(b)
Cost of living increase _____(c)
Merit _____(d)
Combination of____,_____, and _____

WHAT IS THE HIGHEST AND LOWEST SALARY PAID FOR FULL TIME TEACHING DURING THE CURRENT ACADEMIC YEAR? High_____Low_____

DO FACULTY RECEIVE EXTRA COMPENSATION FOR EXTRA TEACHING? Yes__No__

ON WHAT BASIS IS COMPENSATION FOR EXTRA TEACHING COMPUTED?_____

_____

DO FACULTY RECEIVE EXTRA COMPENSATION FOR SUPERVISION OF INDEPENDENT STUDY, RESEARCH, INTERNSHIPS BY UNDERGRADUATES? Yes_____No_____

DOES YOUR COLLEGE HAVE A MERIT SALARY SYSTEM? Yes____No_____
IF NO, WHY IS MERIT NOT USED ON YOUR CAMPUS? (TOO DIFFICULT TO JUDGE CRITERIA, ETC.?)_____

_____

IF YES, WHO IS ELIGIBLE FOR "MERIT" PAY?

Full-time teaching: Yes_____No_____
Full-time administration: Yes_____No_____
Part-time teaching: Yes_____No_____
Part-time administration: Yes_____No_____

IS THERE A LIMIT TO THE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR MERIT PAY? Yes_____No_____

CONCERNING FULL-TIME TEACHING FACULTY ONLY:

What criteria are used to determine merit increases?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

Who designed the above criteria?

_____

Did the faculty vote on acceptance of the criteria?

_____

WHO DECIDES WHETHER A MERIT INCREASE SHALL BE RECOMMENDED AND SUBSEQUENTLY GRANTED? (IF MORE THAN ONE, INDICATE ORDER OF RECOMMENDATION - 1ST, 2ND...FROM LOWEST TO HIGHEST AUTHORITY):

Department Chairperson: _____
Division Chairperson: _____
Academic Dean: _____
President: _____
Board of Trustees: _____

INDICATE THE DOLLAR VALUE OF "MERIT" AWARDS MADE TO INDIVIDUALS ON YOUR CAMPUS:

| | Number of Awards |
|---|---|
| $ 0 - 500 | _____ |
| 501 - 1,000 | _____ |
| 1,001 - 1,500 | _____ |
| 1,501 - 2,000 | _____ |
| more than 2,000 | _____ |

ARE ANY "MERIT" AWARDS MADE WHICH ARE NOT MONETARY? Yes___No_____
IF YES, PLEASE LIST:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

IS YOUR FACULTY REPRESENTED BY A BARGAINING UNIT? Yes_____No_____
IF YES, PLEASE IDENTIFY (AAUP, NEA...)_____
IF YES, IS A MERIT SYSTEM OF SALARY INCREASES PART OF THE FACULTY CONTRACT? Yes_____No_____

WOULD YOU LIKE TO HAVE A COPY OF THE FINAL ANALYSIS OF THE DATA?
Yes_____No_____

YOUR NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

CITY: _____ STATE: _____ ZIP CODE: _____

VITA

Dr. Joseph A. Keane is the Director of Continuing Education and an Assistant Professor of Physics at St. Thomas Aquinas College in Sparkill, New York. He received his bachelors degree from Union College and his doctorate in nuclear physics from The Ohio State University. He is co-author of a number of technical articles and is active in a number of projects concerning evaluation procedures of teaching at the collegiate level.